

Remarks

In response to the Office Action mailed May 24, 2006, the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. In the present application, independent claims 1, 9, 14, 19, and 22 have been amended. The claims have been amended to clarify that the protocol server is in direct communication with the intranet and that the system interface determines whether to grant or deny access to the intranet by comparing, at the transaction server, a user ID used to logon to the protocol server to a list of authorized or prohibited intranet users. Support for the above amendments may be found in Figure 2 and in paragraph 0035 of the Specification.

In the Office Action, claims 1-16 and 19-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 first and second paragraphs. Claims 1-3, 5-18, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Willis, Jr. et al. (US 6,738,815, hereinafter “Willis”) in view of Profit, Jr. et al. (US 6,636,831, hereinafter “Profit”) in further in view of Devine et al. (US 6,598,167, hereinafter “Devine”) in further in view of Fortier, Jr. et al. (US 2003/0023601, hereinafter “Fortier”). Claims 1-3, 5-18, and 22 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Willis, in view of Breneman et al. (US 5,974,135, hereinafter “Breneman”), in view of Devine. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Willis, Profit, and Devine, in view of Butts et al. (US 6,223,541, hereinafter “Butts”). Claims 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Devine, in view of Profit, in further view of Willis and Fortier.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §112

In the Office Action, claims 1-16 and 19-22 are rejected as failing to comply with the written description requirement (first paragraph of Section 112) and for being

indefinite (second paragraph of Section 112) based on the negative limitation “non web-based data.” As noted above, the aforementioned limitation has been removed from the claims rendering the rejection of these claims under Section 112 (first and second paragraph) as moot.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-3, 5-18, and 22

In the Office Action, claims 1-3, 5-18, and 22 are rejected as being unpatentable over Willis in view of Profit in further in view of Devine in further in view of Fortier. Although the present Office Action does not specifically address the rejection of the claims in view of the aforementioned references, in order to further prosecution, Applicants will direct their remarks to the remarks presented in the previous Office Action mailed on December 19, 2005 based on the aforementioned references, in view of the presently amended claims. Thus, the rejection of claims 1-3, 5-18, and 22 is respectfully traversed for at least the foregoing reasons.

Amended independent claim 1 specifies a system for permitting a user to access data on a legacy system and an intranet. The system includes a systems interface coupled to the legacy system, wherein the systems interface comprises at least one network address that can be accessed by a computer, wherein the systems interface comprises a first server for managing protocol regarding the computer interfacing with a second server for generating transactions regarding the legacy system, wherein the first server is in direct communication with the intranet, wherein the systems interface is adapted to direct communications from the computer from the at least one network address to a separate network address corresponding to the intranet that is distinct from the legacy

system upon detecting that the user has launched a browser on the computer by the first server for managing protocol bypassing the second server by directing the communications from the computer directly to the intranet, wherein in response to detecting that the user has launched a browser, the system interface determines whether to grant access to the intranet by comparing, at the second server, a user ID used to logon to the first server to a list of authorized intranet users; and wherein further, the computer is in communication with both the at least one network address and the separate network address such that communication with the legacy systems and the intranet is maintained concurrently.

It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Willis, Profit, Devine, and Fortier fails to teach, disclose, or suggest all of the features specified in amended independent claim 1. For example, the combination of references fails to disclose that the first or protocol server is in direct communication with the intranet and that the system interface determines whether to grant access to the intranet by comparing, at the second or transaction server, a user ID used to logon to the first or protocol server to a list of authorized intranet users.

Willis discloses utilizing a communications network to provide mobile users access to legacy systems. Specifically, the system of Willis discloses a client computer in communication with a protocol server which is in communication with a "TechNet" server via an Ethernet link (see Fig. 5). TechNet servers may be utilized to communicate with remote systems including legacy and non-legacy systems (see col. 6, lines 1-5). Willis also discloses the capability for technicians accessing the remote systems to access an intranet (see col. 14, lines 5-19). Willis, however, fails to disclose that the protocol

server is in direct communication with an intranet. Instead, the system of Willis discloses that communications with the remote systems (which may include legacy and non-legacy systems) are made through TechNet servers which are distinct from the protocol server shown in Fig. 5 (also see Fig. 3). Moreover, while Willis does disclose that the TechNet servers may be utilized for a user/PC combination (see col. 12, lines 33-45), Willis fails to disclose a system interface which determines whether to grant access to an intranet by comparing, at a transaction server, a user ID used to logon to a protocol server to a list of authorized intranet users. In particular, the protocol servers discussed in Willis primarily function to conduct the flow of data between a technician and the TechNet servers (see col. 10, lines 40-44). Thus, there is no disclosure in Willis for utilizing a user ID to logon to a protocol server which is in direct communication with an intranet and comparing the user ID to a list of authorized intranet users at the TechNet server.

Profit discloses a server for communication with a legacy system and a server suite for providing content over the Internet or an intranet (not shown) (see col. 6, lines 32-51), however Profit fails to disclose a protocol server in direct communication with an intranet, as disclosed in amended independent claim 1. Profit merely discusses a server for providing content over an intranet without disclosing whether or not the intranet is in direct communication with the server. Furthermore, there is also no disclosure in Profit of a system interface which determines whether to grant access to an intranet by comparing, at a transaction server, a user ID used to logon to a protocol server to a list of authorized intranet users.

Devine, relied upon in the Office Action to cure the deficiencies of Willis and Profit, merely discloses a system and security protocols for enabling a user to interact

with application services provided by remote servers over the Internet or an extranet (see col. 2, lines 55-60). Devine however, fails to disclose a protocol server in direct communication with an intranet or a system interface which determines whether to grant access to an intranet by comparing, at a transaction server, a user ID used to logon to a protocol server to a list of authorized intranet users.

Fortier, relied upon in the Office Action to cure the deficiencies of Willis, Profit, and Devine, is concerned with intercommunication over disparate communication networks (see paragraph 0003). Fortier however, fails to disclose a protocol server in direct communication with an intranet or a system interface which determines whether to grant access to an intranet by comparing, at a transaction server, a user ID used to logon to a protocol server to a list of authorized intranet users.

Based on the foregoing, amended independent claim 1 is allowable and the rejection of this claim should be withdrawn. Claims 2-3 and 5-8 depend from claim 1 and are allowable for at least the same reasons. Amended independent claims 9, 14, and 22 specify similar features as amended independent claim 1. Therefore, these claims are also allowable for at least the same reasons. In addition, claim 9 specifies an interface which determines whether to deny access to the intranet by comparing, at the at least one transaction server, a user ID used to logon to the protocol server to a list of prohibited intranet users. Based on the discussion above, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Willis, Profit, Devine, and Fortier also fails to disclose these features. Therefore, claim 9 is also allowable for at least these additional reasons.

Claims 10-13 depend from claim 9 and claims 15-18 depend from claim 14. Thus, these claims specify at least the same features as claims 9 and 14 and thus are also

allowable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 2-3, 5-18, and 22 should also be withdrawn.

In the Office Action, claims 1-3, 5-18, and 22 are also rejected as being unpatentable over Willis in view of Breneman, in view of Devine. As discussed above, the combination of Willis and Devine fails to teach, disclose, or suggest a protocol server in direct communication with an intranet and a system interface which determines whether to grant (or deny) access to the intranet by comparing, at a transaction server, a user ID used to logon to the protocol server to a list of authorized (or prohibited) intranet users. Breneman, relied upon in the Office Action to cure the deficiencies of Willis and Devine, is directed towards a system for providing a single interface for concurrently accessing disparate systems. Breneman however, fails to disclose a protocol server in direct communication with an intranet or a system interface which determines whether to grant (or deny) access to an intranet by comparing, at a transaction server, a user ID used to logon to a protocol server to a list of authorized (or prohibited) intranet users. Based on the foregoing, claims 1-3, 5-18, and 22 are allowable and the rejection of these claims should be withdrawn.

Claim 4

Claim 4 is rejected as being unpatentable over Willis, Profit and Devine, in view of Butts. The rejection of this claim is respectfully traversed.

Claim 4 depends from amended independent claim 1 and thus specifies at least the same features. As discussed above, the combination of Willis, Profit, and Devine fails to teach, disclose, or suggest each of the features specified in claim 1. Therefore, claim 4 is allowable over these references for at least the same reasons. Butts, relied

upon in the Office Action to cure the deficiencies of Willis, Profit, and Devine, merely discloses a server and a web browser terminal for persistent connection to a legacy host system (see col. 1, lines 53-55). Butts however, fails to disclose a system interface which determines whether to grant access to an intranet by comparing, at a transaction server, a user ID used to logon to a protocol server to a list of authorized intranet users, as specified in claim 1. Therefore, claim 4 is allowable and the rejection of this claim should be withdrawn.

Claims 19-21

Claims 19-21 are rejected as being unpatentable over Devine, in view of Profit, in further view of Willis and Fortier. The rejection of these claims is respectfully traversed.

Amended independent claim 19 specifies similar features as amended independent claim 9. Based on the discussion above with respect to claim 9, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Willis, Profit, Devine, and Fortier fails to teach, disclose, or suggest each of the features specified in amended independent claim 19. Therefore, claim 19 is allowable and the rejection of this claim should be withdrawn. Claims 20-21 depend from claim 19. Thus, these claims specify at least the same features as claim 19 and thus are also allowable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 20-21 should also be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application is now in condition for allowance. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to call the Applicants' attorney at the number listed below.

No additional fees are believed due. However, please charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-3025.

Date: August 24, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

/Alton Hornsby III/
Alton Hornsby III, Reg. #47299

Withers & Keys, LLC
P.O. Box 71355
Marietta, GA 30007-1355
(404) 849-2093